

Appn No. 10/713,065
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004
Response to Office action of August 25, 2004

3

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The objections and submissions made by the Examiner in the Office Action have been carefully considered. Appropriate amendments have been introduced to the claims. It is submitted that distinguishing features are present and have now been brought out in the amended claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 to 8 on the basis that the dependent claims 2 to 8 refer to a support structure that has not been defined in the independent claim 1. In response, all claims have been amended to refer to a printhead assembly. In addition, in response to a further comment of the Examiner, the indefinite article "an" has been included in claim 1 between the terms "from" and "odd".

Claims Rejections

Claim 1 has been rejected as being anticipated by Sakai et al. (US 5,894,316). It is submitted that this objection is no longer relevant in view of the amendments introduced to claim 1. As admitted by the Examiner, the multilayer structure disclosed in Sakai is a **printhead**. In contrast, the main feature of the present invention, as defined in claim 1, is now specifically limited to a **support beam** and is no longer anticipated by Sakai.

A further argument against such an anticipation becomes apparent when one considers the overall context of the specification. It is well known in the art of printhead manufacturing that the effective coefficient of expansion of a printhead is approximately equal to that of silicon. However, the main feature of the present invention is not directed to the printhead itself, but to the supporting beam for such a printhead. In particular the inventive concept here is the provision of a supporting beam that has an expansion coefficient similar to that of silicon, and, therefore, to that of the printhead to be supported by the beam. This allows the manufacturing of printhead assemblies which exhibit reduced misalignment due to temperature variations.

In view of the above comments, the Applicant appeals to the Examiner for the withdrawal of this objection.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the helpful comments in this section.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appn No. 10/713,065
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004
Response to Office action of August 25, 2004

4

In light of the introduced amendments and the above discussions, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKewed/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.